REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks made herein.

In response to the Final Office Action, dated June 30, 2010, claims 1-3 and 6-8 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8 are independent claims.

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 stand objected to because of the following informalities: the claims were missing proper punctuation where appropriate to facilitate understanding/clear interpretation of the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree, however, to further prosecution claims 1 and 3 have been amended to correct punctuation errors. The Final Office Action indicates a "Clean Copy" of the claims attached, demonstrates a possible solution. However, the clean copy was not attached to the Final Office Action, as mailed. Further the clean copy is also not in PAIR. Applicants request the proposed clean copy be sent to the applicants in a new office action.

Claim 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. However the Final Office fails to indicated why claim 8 is indefinite. Applicant's request that the reason why claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph be sent to the applicants in a new office action.

Claim 1-3 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement, in that, "The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The NEW MATTER can be found by looking at claim 1, limitation (b), attached below, emphasis added."

"b. **a processor** to **(i)** receive said itinerary search request **(ii)** compute at least one itinerary from said search criterion by using a transport database, said itinerary considering ***two or more*** forms..."

Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 7 as originally filed reads: "7. A program comprising instructions for performing an itinerary search method as claimed in claim 3, when it is executed by a processor." Thus, the term processor is supported in the specification.

Further, page 1, lines 1-5 reads: "The invention relates to a system comprising at least a communication network, a user entity and a server entity, in which the user entity transmits requests relating to services to **a server** entity and receives responses indicating service providers originating from said server entity.

The invention also relates to **a server** entity intended to be used in such a system."

Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in art at the time of the invention would clearly know that, for example:

a server computer is a computer, or series of computers, that link other computers or electronic devices together. They often provide essential services across a network, either to private users inside a large organization or to public users via the Internet. For example, when you enter a query in a search engine, the query is sent from your computer over the internet to the servers that store all the relevant web pages. The results are sent back by the server to your computer. Many servers have dedicated functionality such as web servers, print servers, and database servers.

Hardware requirements for servers vary, depending on the server application. Absolute CPU speed is not usually as critical to a server as it is to a desktop machine. Servers' duties to provide service to many users over a network lead to different requirements like fast network connections and high I/O throughput. Servers often run for long periods without interruption and availability must often be very high, making hardware reliability and durability extremely important. Although servers can be built from commodity computer parts, mission-critical servers use specialized hardware with low failure rates in order to maximize uptime. For example, servers may incorporate faster, higher-capacity hard drives, larger computer fans or water cooling to help remove heat, and uninterruptible power supplies that ensure the servers continue to function in the event of a power failure. These components offer higher performance and reliability at a correspondingly higher price. Hardware redundancy—installing more than one instance of modules such as power supplies and hard disks arranged so that if one fails another is automatically available—is widely used. ECC memory devices which detect and correct errors are used; non-ECC memory is more likely to cause data corruption.See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Server_(computing)

Thus, as noted above, a server may include any number of well known components including a processor.

Further, applicants note that page 5, line 29 – page 6, line 3 reads:

Fig. 4 shows three series of two curves to explain the operation of the itinerary search method according to the invention.

In each series of curves, the high curve **corresponds to the itinerary computed for transport by car and the low curve corresponds to the computed itinerary by using public transport.** On the low curves, the stations at which the user may interrupt his journey are indicated by dots. The first series of curves K1 represents the itineraries computed in step S3. The second series of curves K2 represents an example of the mode of selecting a service provider, as performed in step S4. The third series of curves K3 represents the response elaborated in step S5.

Although the term "two or more forms" is not used in the specification, as noted above the limitation of "computing at least one itinerary responding to said search criterion by using a transport database, said itinerary considering two or more forms of transportation to determine an optimal itinerary" is well supported in the specification.

Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 6-8 comply with 35 USC 112, first paragraph, and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully requests removal of these rejections.

Claim 1-3 and 5-8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.: 5,948,040 (Delorme). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 1-3 and 7-8 recite the limitations of "compute at least one itinerary from said search criterion by using a transport database, said itinerary considering *two or more forms of transportation to determine an optimal itinerary based on various transport modes...*"

The Final Office Action indicates that the above limitations are shown in "Fig 5, D - clearly shows traversed zones being considered." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fig 5D "illustrates a multimedia travelog preview about such a set of points of interest found along the route at 503 plus a related "map ticket" dialog box for transactional TRIPS user input e.g. to make reservations, buy tickets, get special offer coupons, and so forth – according to the present TRIPS invention. Thus, users are enabled to consider supplemental text, graphic and audio travel information on selected location or POIs nearby possible routes for purposes of making travel plans and arrangements in TRIPS."

Applicants can find nothing in DeLorme that teaches the claimed limitation of "compute at least one itinerary from said search criterion by using a transport database, said itinerary considering *two or more forms of transportation to determine an optimal itinerary based on various transport modes…*"

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. DeLorme cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because DeLorme fails to disclose each and every element recited.

Having shown that the device resulting from the teachings of the cited reference

does not include all the elements of the present invention, applicant submits that the reasons for the examiner's rejections of the claims have been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of instant claims 1-3 and 6-8.

For the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that all the objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Entry of the amendment, all the rejections be withdrawn and a Notice of Allowance be issued is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski
Registration No. 42,079

/Thomas J. Onka/
Date: August 25, 2010   By: Thomas J. Onka
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,053

Mail all correspondence to:

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615